

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1, 5-9, 12, 13, and 16-18 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 6, 8, and 9 are independent.

Claims 1 and 9 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that claims 6-8, 13, and 16-18 are allowed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 4,972,951 (Vartanian). Further, claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vartanian in view of JP 2003-236953 (Nakajima). Further, claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Vartanian taken together with U.S. Patent 6,116,427 (Wu). Further, claim 12 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Vartanian taken together with Wu and further in view of Nakajima.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

A complete discussion of the Examiner's rejection is set forth in the Office Action, and is not being repeated here.

The Office Action alleges that Vartanian teaches a tray comprising a bottom section (20) supports a display substrate (video tape, column 2, lines 23-27) on at least a portion of a planar top surface (18) of the bottom section in the vicinity of the center of the display substrate, wherein the display substrate contacts at least a portion of the bottom section in the vicinity of the center of the display substrate.

In further arguments provided in a section "Response to Arguments," the Examiner alleges that the glass substrate can come in a variety of shapes such as one end of the substrate having a projection and the recess (20) can accommodate the projection part of the substrate when the glass is resting on the bottom surface. As an alternative, the Examiner alleges that a spacer can be inserted in the recess (20) to support the glass substrate when it is mounted on the bottom surface. Further,

the Examiner alleges that Vartanian's bottom surface with recess (20) has the ability of supporting the glass substrate.

In other words, the Examiner considers the stepped down surface 18 of Vartanian as teaching the claimed planar top surface of the bottom section.

Applicant submits that as can be seen in Figs. 2 and 3 of Vartanian, the stepped down portion 18 does not have a portion that would be sufficient to support a substrate that is the subject of the present invention. In particular, the stepped down portion 18 is a ledge around the periphery and has an area that may support at most only a small portion of the area of a substrate. Furthermore, the limited area of the stepped down portion 18 would likely result in sagging of a display substrate.

Applicant submits that stepped down portion 18 of Vartanian does not have a portion which is at least the area of the majority of the bottom surface area of a display substrate.

Thus, Applicant has amended claims 1 and 9 to recite that the portion of the planar top surface supporting the display substrate is at least the area of the majority of the bottom surface area of the display substrate. The claim amendment is based on the specification at page 15, lines 5-10, of the specification, and Fig. 3.

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

In addition, the Examiner alleges that the bottom area of ledge 42 constitutes a section to be engaged by a carrying section. Applicant submits that the position that ledge 42, as well as bottom area of the ledge, cannot function as a section to be engaged by a carrying section. In particular, flange 15 is shown as coming into contact with a surface (e.g., floor). In the case of a stacked tray, the ledge 42 of the upper tray rests on the upper surface of the side wall 22 (col. 3, lines 1-6). Thus, it can be seen that ledge 42 would not be accessible for carrying the display substrate accommodating tray.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Vartanian fails to teach at least the claimed flange-like engaging section.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all

presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Robert W. Downs, Registration No. 48222 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: June 25, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By Robert Downs #48222
Charles Gorenstein *Robert Downs*
Registration No.: 29271
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
703-205-8000